



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/019,350	10/19/2001	Michael Franks Robinson	0892161.000000US	1373

7590 12/16/2003
Townsend and Townsend and Crew
Two Embarcadero Center 8th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111

EXAMINER

ANDERSON, MATTHEW A

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1765

DATE MAILED: 12/16/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/019,350

Applicant(s)

ROBINSON, MICHAEL FRANKS

Examiner

Matthew A. Anderson

Art Unit

1765

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 October 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 19 October 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 10203.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-4, 6, 8-10, 12-15, 27-28, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ishizumi (JP-0-683249 A).

Ishizumi et al. discloses a method and apparatus for vapor growth. The method is described in the abstract as capable of growing a compound semiconductor layer having an evenness and an interfacial sharpness in units of atomic layers with a good productivity. Thus a method is commonly known in the art as a atomic layer epitaxy (ALE) or deposition (ALD). (see col. 1 and 2 Description of Prior art.) An example of the apparatus is shown in Fig. 1. Starting in col. 7, Fig. 1 is described. The chamber (1) has a cylindrical portion (1b) extending in a vertical direction. Portion (1b) has an upper (1a) and lower (1c) portion. (1a) is the end from which reactants are introduced through pipes (2) and (3). One pipe supplies the cation and the other the anion of the compound semiconductor to be formed. A substrate holder (5) lies in the cylindrical portion (1b) and holds the substrate (4). The example shown in Figs. 2A, 2b, and 2C shows the use of the partition plate (6) as the substrate is rotated from the, in this case,

Art Unit: 1765

TMG side to the Arsine side. The gases are supplied sequentially to grow the GaAs (a III-V semiconductor) film of the substrate as the raw material gases are decomposed. Figs. 5A-5D show a modification in which hydrogen is used to form the partition of gases (i.e. a gas shield) within the chamber. Other compound semiconductors can be grown such as zinc selenide (see Fig. 7), gallium nitride (see Fig. 8), and gallium indium phosphide (Fig. 9). A useable substrate material is given in col. 12 line 15-20 as the known semiconductor GaAs. The examiner notes that many semiconductors are known in addition to SiC, such as GaAs. Heat is described as supplied to the substrate by the built-in heater in the substrate holder (5). Temperatures are specific to the material to be deposited and examples in col. 13 include 500°C and 800-1000°C for GaN.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 5, 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ishizumi et al. as applied to claims 1-4, 6, 8-10, 12-15 above.

Ishizumi et al. is described above.

Ishizumi et al. does not disclose the deposition of SiC.

In respect to claims 5 and 7, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the present invention to use the method of Ishizumi et al. to deposit the known compound semiconductor SiC because Ishizumi et al. suggest such use for non-specific compound semiconductor deposition. (col. 2 lines 45-50) Motivation would be found in that a broad range of compound semiconductors deposited would expand process flexibility.

5. Claims 11, 16-26, 29, 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ishizumi et al. as applied to claims 1-10, 12-15, 27-28 above, and further in view of Oki (JP-58-125698) and Neda et al. (US 5,656,773).

Ishizumi et al. is described above.

Ishizumi et al. does not explicitly disclose separate temperatures for the raw materials or the use of a catalyst material as the eating wire.

Oki et al. discloses a method and an apparatus in which separate gas streams are used to supply raw material compounds to a reactor used in deposition of a compound III-V semiconductor. (see abstract) A line supplying one raw material (6) has a separate heating element (7) within it. Fig. 3 shows an electrically activated (i.e. a wire) heater. The other raw material is supplied to the reactor separately. A heating RF coil (3) heats the substrate (4) within the chamber.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the present invention to combine the Oki and Ishizumi et al. disclosures because then the

temperatures at which the raw materials were decomposed could be more easily controlled as suggested by Oki et al. (see page 3 of the translation, 1st full para.).

Neda et al. discloses a device with a heating wire. In column 5 lines 59-64, it was conventional to use Pt heating wires.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the present invention to use Pt (a known and common chemical catalyst) as a heating wire because it was successfully used in such a capacity in the past. Additionally, one of ordinary skill with only rudimentary chemical knowledge would know that Pt is commonly known as a noble metal because of its resistance to chemical reaction.

In respect to claim 11, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the present invention to optimize the temperature of the substrate because temperature was known to effect the deposition process and two temperatures was suggested by Oki et al.

In respect to claims 16, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 30 it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the present invention to produce the apparatus thus described with a wire heater in one supply inlet, a heater to heat the substrate, a means for moving the substrate because Oki suggests such as for controlling the temperatures of the raw material gas streams of such deposition systems. The manner in which the apparatus is actually used is not germane to the question of patentability of that apparatus.

In respect to claim 29, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the present invention to form the heating wire from Pt (a known

catalyst) because such material was used by Neda as a wire heater and because of the commonly known property of Pt as a non-reactive noble metal.

In respect to claim 17, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the present invention to form the second inlet adjacent to the substrate support because that is where the raw material is directed.

In respect to claim 18, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the present invention to design a gas inlet including an elongate slot or just a plain hole because the Oki et al. has slots as does Ishizumi et al. where gas is admitted to the chamber and the working of such slots is well within the limits of engineering skill.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 10/24/2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The argument that the Ishizumi reference fails to teach every aspect of the claim is not persuasive. Ishizumi discloses compound semiconductor films formed from different precursor gases. For example, as in Fig. 2A, TMG and arsine. These are different chemical compounds and inherently have different properties including decomposition temperature. Deposition occurs in Ishizumi so that the precursors are heated at least to their respective decomposition temperatures. The examiner reads

the claims as broadly as possible. The substrate is heated. Thus heating occurs at or adjacent to the substrate.

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Oki discloses that separate heating is desirable and workable in deposition using gas precursors. Ishizumi uses TMG which is a well known metal organic precursor.

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). The question as to what the combination would look like and then arguing that Ishizumi doesn't teach that is not persuasive. Separate precursor inflows are taught in both references. Thus, one would have Oki's heating wire in one inflow. The precursor is cracked adjacent (i.e. nearby) the substrate in Oki.

The argument that no change to the internal chamber configuration would be undertaken is not convincing since Oki's wire is in the input tube and not in the chamber proper.

The applicant has not defined "adjacent" to means any limited distance and the examiner has interpreted adjacent to mean "nearby" as per Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary (10th Edition) 1998. Since the precursors are deposited on the substrate they must at least be nearby.

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matthew A. Anderson whose telephone number is (703) 308-0087. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th, 7:30-6.

Application/Control Number: 10/019,350
Art Unit: 1765

Page 9

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nadine Norton can be reached on (703) 305-2667. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

MAA
December 3, 2003

SUPERVISOR
NADINE G. NORTON
PRIMARY EXAMINER
